“Boids” is the phonetic spelling of “Birds” when spoken with a New York accent.
Flocking Simulation

- Originally simulator for the flocking behaviour of birds
- Simple set of rules
  - Emergent Behaviour
    - Complexity arises from the interaction of individual Boids
Boids Rules

- Separation
- Alignment
- Cohesion

Images Credit: http://www.red3d.com/cwr/boids/
Implementation Example
CSE633 Boids - Implementation & Analysis

Flocking Simulation: by Shaun Cosgrove
Boids Rules

- Separation
- Alignment
- Cohesion

Images Credit http://www.red3d.com/cwr/boids/
Static Spatial Decomposition

- Divide total area into sub areas
- Assign each sub area to a processor
- Perform computation on each sub area
- Sync data
- Repeat

~4000m
### Shared Borders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Computation on any sub areas requires data from every neighbour.
- Transmit all boids to / from neighbours?
- Necessary to reduce communication requirements for faster implementation.
Sub Area Optimizations

- Binning of Boids
- Each sub area divided into bins
- Boid algorithm performed on binned Boids
Border Communication

- Boids sphere of influence goes outside local sub area
- Correct Simulation Requires Data from each neighbour
- Make each computation communicate with neighbours for data?
- How much data to get?
- Efficiency very important
Communication Optimization

- Take the border bins
- TX and RX all boids in these bins to their respective neighbours
- Buffer neighbour Boids for processing in all sub-areas
- Ensures correct simulation in all sub areas
Application Sequence

- Processing → Comm → Barrier
- Processing → Comm → Barrier
- Processing → Comm → Barrier
- Processing → Comm → Barrier
Notes

- Running time of algorithm is heavily dependent on Boids configuration
- Tighter flocking results in slower running times
- This implementation:
  - Un-optimized
  - Heavily dependent on arraylists
  - Has a large memory overhead
Test Setup

- Fixed area \( \sim 4000 \times 4000 \) m
- Fixed bin dimension of \( 40 \times 40 \) m
- Variable bin size per test size
- Scalable implementation
- 900 - 230,400 Boids
- 3x3 - 10x10 sub areas
Brute Force Vs Optimized Algorithms
Optimized Algorithm Single Instance
Optimized Algorithm - Parallel Instance Times
The graph shows the Speed Up vs Boids for different numbers of instances. The X-axis represents the number of Boids, and the Y-axis represents the speed up. Different line styles and colors represent different numbers of instances, with 16 instances represented by blue squares, 49 by red circles, 64 by yellow triangles, 81 by green triangles, and 100 by maroon diamonds. The graph indicates that as the number of Boids increases, the speed up decreases for all instance numbers, with 100 instances showing the least speed up for a given number of Boids.
Theoretical Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boids</th>
<th>Comp: Brute</th>
<th>Comp: Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>810000</td>
<td>8100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>3240000</td>
<td>16200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3600</td>
<td>12960000</td>
<td>32400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7200</td>
<td>51840000</td>
<td>64800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14400</td>
<td>207360000</td>
<td>129600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28800</td>
<td>829440000</td>
<td>259200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brute force: (Nested for loop)
As each Boid must be checked against every other Boid to determine if it is in its sphere of influence, this is a $O(n^2)$ algorithm.

Grid based: Assuming even Boid distribution
Each Grid has a size that is no less than the sphere of influence of the individual Boids. To correctly perform the simulation for Boid_A, only the Boids in the 8 neighbouring Grids and the Boids in the current Grid need to be checked. As these will be the only Boids that can be in the sphere of influence of Boid_A the simulation will be accurate. With even Boid distribution, this is a $O(a*n)$ algorithm for some constant $a$.

The table above shows the number of comparisons required to perform the algorithm for one cycle for an increasing number of boids.
Actual Growth Rate*

- Growth of the optimized version increases towards $O(n^2)$ with large numbers of boids but its running time is orders of magnitude faster than the Brute Force algorithm.

*Running times for brute force are projected above 14400 Boids. The actual growth rate is expected to be at least this amount.
Actual Growth Rate 16 proc

- The growth of the optimized algorithm moves towards $O(n^2)$ after a certain number of boids is reached.

- Note: The tests run with smaller number of Boids will show greater jitter due to the small scale of the simulation, the mpi implementation and certain other random factors inherent to the simulation.
Actual Growth Rate 81 proc

- Again, the growth of the optimized algorithm moves towards $O(n^2)$ after a certain number of boids is reached.
- This is true for no matter the number of processors that are used in the test.
Actual Growth Rate
Actual Growth Rate

- As the number of Boids increases, the growth rate of the optimized algorithm nears or exceeds $O(n^2)$
- This will be in part due to uneven distribution of the Boids during the simulation for the optimized algorithm. The Boids will naturally flock together in certain regions meaning that for a Boid in a dense region, many more comparisons will be required to correctly execute the simulation.
- As more Boids are added to the same space, the Boids will be more compact compounding the natural grouping nature of the Boids and the growth of the optimized algorithm increases
- For simulations with larger numbers of Boids, even though the growth rate is similar to the brute force algorithm, the actual running time per instance is orders of magnitude faster as can be seen in the first graph above
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